

**Minutes**  
**State Board of Education Special Meeting**  
**Tuesday, January 4, 2005**

The Arizona State Board of Education held a special meeting at the Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007. The meeting was called to order at 4:05 PM.

**Members Present**

Ms. Armida Bittner *via telephone*  
Dr. Matthew Diethelm, Vice President  
Ms. JoAnne Hilde  
Ms. Evangelina "Conkie" Hoover *via telephone*  
Superintendent Tom Horne  
Ms. Joanne Kramer  
Dr. John Pedicone *via telephone*

**Members Absent**

Ms. Nadine Mathis-Basha, President  
Dr. Michael Crow

**Board Business**

Pledge of Allegiance, moment of silence and roll call.

1. Opening Comments

Board members did not have additional comments at this time.

2. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve the Criteria for Administering the Funds Allocated for High School Student Tutoring Services.

Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan, Associate Superintendent of Academic Achievement, Arizona Department of Education, presented background information and reviewed each document provided in this item. (Please see materials provided in packet). Ms. Dugan noted that there are seventeen alternative service providers who give assistance to high schools and fourteen of these providers have agreed to become providers in this project. She added that under No Child Left Behind, NCLB, all high schools have to hire staff approved by its principal. The recommended tutoring fee is \$30 per hour for schools and \$40 per hour for alternative service providers allowing for additional expenses incurred by a business. Ms. Dugan noted that the application will be accessible on-line until February 1, 2005.

Further discussion ensued regarding the following:

- Individual student plans are not reported, but should be an essential point to assure student gets specific assistance for specific strands;
- Add a column on the Attendance Log where the subject area, broken into strands, that the student is being tutored on can be indicated which would add more accountability;
- Some tutoring is computer-based but would still be individualized to the student's needs and the method of tutoring could be indicated on the providers' applications;
- The minimum number of hours that has been set for tutoring is recommended to be actual communication/contact with the student;
- Concern regarding the difference in price between teachers and alternative service providers which could create some sense of inequity;

Mr. John Wright, President, Arizona Education Association, noted the following regarding this issue:

- There is no definition of exceptionally qualified. What we are looking for are teachers who are teaching in an area for which they are certified. This definition could be applied differently across the state.
- There is no clear accountability of how a school demonstrates how the \$30/hour has been spent, i.e., paying a teacher \$30/hour or paying a teacher \$20/hour to tutor and \$10/hour for employment-related expenses or \$20/hour to tutor and \$10/hour for other associated services.
- Alternative providers. This seems like Arizona's back-door voucher program. There is a basic philosophical dispute that the AEA has with using tax dollars for profit-making purposes. Mr. Wright asked the Board not to approve the list of alternative service providers. Mr. Wright added

that outside consultants differ from alternative service providers in that outside consultants do not provide classroom instruction to Arizona students.

Dr. Diethelm noted that the intention is to bring the maximum number of resources to bear for the purpose of achieving the maximum amount of student success.

Superintendent Horne responded to the issues raised by Mr. Wright as follows:

- He favors alternative service providers because it provides more choice for students and parents; Congress and our own state legislature has indicated its mandates in NCLB and in the tutoring fund, respectively;
- The pay rate is for time the teacher spends with the student and not for preparation or materials; and
- Students need to pass the tests and the principal must exercise judgment in choosing the most qualified teachers.

Further discussion ensued regarding:

- Two different rates and if one rate is desired, should be \$30/hour;
- The possibility of a sense of inequity;
- Concern regarding the possibility of whether a teacher who was not successful being asked to tutor;
- Assisting parents in understanding the opportunities and choices involved;
- Costs to the local district not being significantly different than costs to a private business;
- A lower hourly rate could result in less service; and
- Rural districts could provide the service and utilize teachers already employed in the district.

Ms. Becky Hill, Education Advisor, Office of the Governor, stated that the Governor would prefer a rate of \$30/hour to create an even playing field while maintaining quality.

Dr. Diethelm summarized that the suggestion from the Governor's Office is to set the rate of \$30/hour for all providers, maintain the ability to look at results after two-three months, and make changes if necessary.

Dr. Pedicone cautioned regarding adding responsibilities to a district's administration and the possibility of creating a morale/inequity issue.

Superintendent Horne noted that he is in favor of the \$40/hour rate since alternative services providers have been contacted and that rate has been discussed with them. He added that if the rest of the Board favors \$30/hour for everyone at first and if subsequent reports show that this severely limits the number of providers adjustments can be considered at that time.

Motion by Superintendent Horne to approve the tutoring program as presented to include the list of providers as presented and that the rate of \$30/hour be set for all providers whether they be public schools, teachers or private providers. Seconded by Ms. Kramer. It was noted by Dr. Diethelm that the suggested modifications to some of the forms and particularly the Attendance Log to indicate the standard, concept and strand the student is being tutored on, were not included in the motion. However, the Department has given assurance that those changes will be included. *Motion passes.*

3. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A) (1) Possible Executive Session Regarding State Board Personnel. The Board may Consider the Appointment of the Executive Director for the State Board of Education.

Dr. Diethelm stated that the Sub-Committee of the State Board of Education has conducted a search and selected Mr. Vince Yanez to be nominated as Executive Director. Motion by Ms. Bittner to nominate Mr. Vince Yanez as Executive Director of the State Board of Education. Seconded by Ms. Hilde. *Motion passes.*

ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Hilde. Seconded by Ms. Kramer. *Motion passes.*

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.